



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,776	06/18/2001	Pavitra Subramaniam	5306P034	2438
8791	7590	08/10/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN			LU, KUEN S	
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEVENTH FLOOR				2167
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030				

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/883,776	SUBRAMANIAM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kuen S. Lu	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,10-13,15-18,20-23,25-28 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,10-13,15-18,20-23,25-28 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/2/2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments

1. The Action is responsive to the Applicant's Amendments, filed on March 31, 2005.
2. The Applicant's amendments made to claims 1, 5-6, 10-11, 15-6, 20-21, 25-26 and 30 are considered and addressed in the Office Action for non-Final Rejection (hereafter "the Action", as described below. Noted is claims 4, 9, 14, 19, 24 and 29 were previously cancelled.
3. As for the Applicant's Remarks made in the Amendment concerning allowability with respect to claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20-23 25-28 and 30 have been considered but are moot on the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11-13, 15, 17-19, 21-23, 25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are inoperative and therefore lack utility by without specifying what methods or systems to implement. The Examiner would suggest all claims starting with "A method", "The method", "A system", "The system", "The machine-readable medium" and "A machine-readable medium" be amended to "A computer-implemented method", "The computer-implemented method", "A computer-implemented system", "The computer-implemented system", "The computer machine-readable medium" and "A computer machine-readable medium", respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11-13, 15, 17-18 21-23, 25 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouchard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,334,124), in view of Game (U.S. Publication 2001/0020235).

As per independent claims 1, 11 and 21, Bouchard teaches “generating search indices on a server” at col. 3, lines 11-17 where a user conducting a keyword search for a keyword or subject and be furnished by server computer with a list of containing record references to the records that satisfy the search criteria.

Bouchard does not specifically teach the search indices are “being associated with corresponding business components”.

However, Game teaches indexing organization or individual details for facilitating searching at Page 2, [0057].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants’ invention was made to combine Game’s teaching into Bouchard’s by

applying the techniques of utilizing virtual addresses to index entities to conduct local search at the client level because both references are dedicated to searching and transmitting data on network, the combined teaching would have improved search effectively and facilitating data transfer on the network.

Bouchard further teaches the following:

"providing the search indices to a client, the client perform search using data records stored on the client" at the Abstract where search indexes are transmitted to the client computer and the searches are performed locally at the client computer;
"providing one or more selected search indices to the client, the one or more selected search indices to be used for searching on the client" at Fig. 3, elements 302-308, col. 8, lines 16-18 by transmitting client indices from the server to the client computers, and, "wherein search index related information including index identifier and search engine identifier is stored in a first table and search index related to file attachments are stored in a second table" at col. 6, lines 56-64 by the cooperation between server and client computers to maintain and update client indices at the client computers.

As per claims 2, 12 and 22, Bouchard further teaches "each search index is associated to a corresponding search category" at col. 3, lines 8-17 by predefining search keys as keywords or subjects.

As per claims 3, 13 and 23, Bouchard further teaches “displaying a list of search categories that are associated to the search indices” at col. 7, lines 34-40 by associating server indices with server data repository.

As per claims 5, 15 and 25, Bouchard further teaches “performing a database synchronization operation to download index files containing search indices as attachments onto the client” at col. 6, lines 56-64 by supplying the client computer with search indices and updating the indices as time goes by.

As per claims 7, 17 and 27, Bouchard further teaches “each search index is represented by a corresponding search index object which includes an index identifier and a business component identifier of a specific business component to which the respective search index is associated” at col. 7, lines 34-40 by associating server indices with server data repository and col. 3, lines 8-11, by predefining keywords or subjects as search indices.

As per claims 8, 18 and 28, Bouchard further teaches “defining a search index object for each business component that needs to be indexed by a search engine” at col. 3, lines 8-11, by predefining keywords or subjects as search indices; and “associating the respective search index object to the corresponding business component” at col. 7, lines 34-40 by associating server indices with server data repository and col. 3, lines 8-11, by predefining keywords or subjects as search indices.

8. Claims 6, 10, 16, 20, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouchard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,334,124) in view of Game (U.S. Publication 2001/0020235), as applied to Claims 1-3, 5, 11-13, 15, 21-23 and 25 above, and further in view of Mao et al. (U.S. Patent 6,546,385, hereafter “Mao”).

As per claims 6, 16 and 26, the combined teaching of Bouchard and Game references teaches transmitting search indices from the server to the client computer (See Bouchard: col. 9, lines 1-9).

The combined teaching of Bouchard and Game references does not specifically teach “performing an uncompress operation to uncompress the index files downloaded from the server into a specific directory on the client”.

However, Mao teaches compressing and decompressing index at col. 2, lines 31-36 and downloading index from server to user’s computing device at col. 2, lines 37-45.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants’ invention was made to combine Mao’s teaching into Game and Bouchard references by enhancing Bouchard’s system with functionality of compressing and decompressing search indices because by doing so the client computer could be hand-held system for more feasible to perform more exhaustive searching of hardcopy documents.

As per claims 10, 20 and 30, Mao further teaches “marking associated index attachment files to be downloaded in response to the client's request for a database synchronization operation” at col. 2, lines 31-36 and 37-45 by using compressing and decompressing techniques for downloading index files from server computer to the user's computer.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record

- A. U.S. Patent No. 6,334,124
- B. U.S. Patent No. 6,546,385
- F. U.S. Publication 2001/0020235

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

- C. U.S. Patent No. 6,041,323
- D. U.S. Patent No. 6,490,575
- E. U.S. Patent No. 6,240,409

Contact information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S. Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 am-5:30 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone pre unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Page 13 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuen S. Lu

Patent Examiner

August 4, 2005


Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner

August 4, 2005